

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-30, 34-39, and 45-77 are pending in the application. The Examiner additionally stated that claims 1-30, 34-39, and 45-77 are rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 28, 36, 45-48, 51, 56, 58, 61, 66, and 72-74 have been amended. Hence, claims 1-30, 34-39, and 45-77 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

In the Claims

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 51-70 and 72-77 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 15-30, 34-39, 45, 48, 50 and 71-73 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Emma et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,353,421 (hereinafter, *Emma*). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner states in the Response to Arguments of the instant Office Action that recitation of the limitation "first and second target address predictions" is extremely vague. Applicant respectfully asserts the limitation is not vague, particularly when read in light of the specification. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 28, 36, 45, 51, 61, and 74 to clarify that the target address predictions are taken target address predictions. Applicant respectfully asserts that even assuming *Emma* may be fairly interpreted according to either of the ways the Examiner suggests in the Response to Arguments of the instant Office Action, *Emma* does not anticipate the claims as amended. In particular, *Emma*'s DHT does not provide a prediction of a taken target

address of a branch instruction. That is, *Emma*'s DHT does not provide a taken target address of a branch instruction that has the possibility of being the incorrect taken target address of the branch instruction.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 28, 36, and 45.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 51-70 and 74-77 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McCormick, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,351,796 (hereinafter, *McCormick*). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

Applicant has amended the claims to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that all the limitations in the claims are required to be found in the prior art.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 51-70 and 74-77.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 74, the Examiner states that *McCormick* teaches a comparator that compares speculative and non-speculative target address predictions, citing col. 18, lines 40-49, which describe operation of the comparator 602 of Fig. 6. Applicant respectfully asserts that *McCormick* does not teach a comparator that compares speculative and non-speculative target address predictions. Rather, the comparator 602 of Fig. 6 compares branch taken/not taken prediction bits (see col. 10, lines 31-39 for a description of the STH chunks) rather than branch target address predictions.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 3-5 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Emma* in view of Gochman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,964,868 (herein *Gochman*). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 6-14, 46, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Emma* in view of Rappoport et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,601,161 (herein *Rappoport*). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

Dependent claims 2-27, 29-30 and 34-35 and 71-73, 37-39, 46-50, 52-60, 62-70, and 75-77 depend from independent claims 1, 28, 36, 45, 51, 61, and 74, respectively, and add further limitations that are neither anticipated nor made obvious by *Emma, McCormick, Gochman, or Rappoport*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to these claims.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the arguments advance above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-30, 34-39, and 45-77 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

/E. Alan Davis/

By: _____

E. ALAN DAVIS
Registration No. 39,954
Tel: (512) 301-7234

8/31/2006

Date: _____